

## NOTES ON THE SECOND CHAPTER OF THE MADHYĀNTAVIBHĀGAṬĪKĀ

by  
J. W. DE JONG  
Canberra

In 1928 Sylvain Lévi obtained in Kathmandu a copy of an incomplete manuscript of Sthiramati's *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*, a commentary on Vasubandhu's *Madhyāntavibhāgabhāṣya* which explains the *kārikā*-s written by Maitreya. Sylvain Lévi entrusted the edition of the text to Yamaguchi Susumu who first edited the Sanskrit text of the first two chapters in several issues of the *Ōtani Gakuhō* in the years 1930–1932.<sup>1</sup> In 1934 Yamaguchi published an edition of the complete text in which the missing parts were restored with the help of the Tibetan translation.<sup>2</sup> In 1930 Tucci announced an edition with a complete restoration into Sanskrit from the Tibetan of all missing passages, by himself and Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭācārya.<sup>3</sup> The first and only chapter of this edition appeared in 1932.<sup>4</sup> Yamaguchi published a complete Japanese translation of the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā* in 1935.<sup>5</sup> The first chapter was rendered into English simultaneously by Th. Stecherbatsky and D. L. Friedmann.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vol. XI (1930), pp. 576–602; Vol. XII (1931), pp. 24–67; 307–335; 719–775; Vol. XIII (1932), pp. 59–99. Cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, I (1932), pp. 400–403 (on p. 400 correct Shukyo-kenkyu to Ōtani Gakuhō).

<sup>2</sup> Sthiramati, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*. Exposition systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda. Tome I. Texte. Nagoya, Hajinkaku, 1934. Reprinted by the Suzuki Research Foundation, Tokyo in 1966.

<sup>3</sup> 'Animadversiones Indicæ', *JASB*, 26 (1930), pp. 195–196.

<sup>4</sup> *Madhyāntavibhāgasūtrabhāṣyaṭīkā* of Sthiramati, being a subcommentary on Vasubandhu's *Bhāṣya* on the *Madhyāntavibhāgasūtra* of Maitreyanātha. Part I, 1932 (Calcutta, Oriental Series, no. 24). Cf. Obermiller's review, *IHQ*, IX (1933), pp. 1019–1030.

<sup>5</sup> Anne ashariya zō Chūbenfunbetsuron shakusho. Nagoya, Hajinkaku, 1935. Reprinted by The Suzuki Research Foundation, Tokyo in 1966.

<sup>6</sup> Th. Stecherbatsky, *Madhyāntavibhaṅga*. Discourse on Discrimination between Middle and Extremes ascribed to Maitreya and commented by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati. Moscow–Leningrad, 1936 (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XXX). Cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, V (1937),

In 1937 Yamaguchi published a synoptic edition of the Tibetan translation and the two Chinese translations by Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang of Vasubandhu's *bhāṣya*.<sup>7</sup> A translation of the third chapter of the *bhāṣya* was published by Paul Wilfred O'Brien S. J. in 1953-1954.<sup>8</sup> In 1934 Rahula Sanskrityāyana discovered a manuscript of the *bhāṣya* in the Nor Monastery in Tibet. The text was published by Gadgin M. Nagao in 1964.<sup>9</sup> Nagao also translated chapters 1 and 3 of the *bhāṣya*<sup>10</sup> and a complete translation is due to appear in vol. 15 of the Daijō butten. Another edition of the *bhāṣya* appeared in 1967.<sup>11</sup> Vasubandhu's *bhāṣya* contains the complete text of the *kārikā*-s. Parts of both the *kārikā*-s and the *bhāṣya* are quoted in Sthiramati's *ṭīkā*. The publication of the text of the *kārikā*-s and the *bhāṣya* makes it possible to correct the text of the quotations in the *ṭīkā*. This is of course especially important for the quotations which have been restored from the Tibetan by the editors of the *ṭīkā*.

The restoration of a Sanskrit text from the Tibetan is a difficult undertaking. I believe that in the case of a philosophical text such as the Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā, which has been carefully translated into Tibetan, it is justified to attempt to reconstruct at least the technical terms. With the help of parallel passages it is also sometimes possible to restore the original Sanskrit text. However, it is certainly impossible to reconstruct the original text in its entirety. La Vallée Poussin, quoting Tucci's words: "by the combined efforts of myself and of Vidhuśekhara Śāstri, it is hoped to be restored completely in its Sanskrit original form", comments as follows: "Magnanime pensée! Car il est rare qu'on puisse restituer avec confiance ne fût-ce qu'une strophe estropiée ou lacuneuse."<sup>12</sup> How different the results of attempted restorations can be is clearly

pp. 271-273. D. L. Friedmann, Sthiramati, Madhyantavibhāgaṭīkā. Analysis of the Middle Path and the Extremes. Utrecht, Utr. Typ. Ass., 1937.

<sup>7</sup> Kanzō taishō Benchūbenron. Nagoya, Hajinkaku, 1939. Reprinted by the Suzuki Research Foundation, Tokyo in 1966.

<sup>8</sup> 'A Chapter on Reality from the Madhyāntavibhāgaśāstra', *Monumenta Nipponica*, 9 (1953), pp. 277-303; 10 (1954), pp. 227-269.

<sup>9</sup> Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya. A Buddhist Philosophical Treatise Edited for the first time from a Sanskrit Manuscript. Tokyo, Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964.

<sup>10</sup> Sekai no meicho, vol. 2: Daijō butten (Tōkyō, 1967), pp. 397-426.

<sup>11</sup> Madhyānta-vibhāga-bhāṣya. Deciphered & Edited by Nathmal Tatia & Anantalal Thakur. Patna, K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967 (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series*, vol. X).

<sup>12</sup> *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, V (1937), p. 401.

shown by the two editions of the first chapter and Stecherbatsky's translation of the same chapter in which many passages have been restored in the notes. Until recently the only text available for chapters 2 to 5 of Sthiramati's *ṭikā* was that published by Yamaguchi in 1934. Yamaguchi's restorations are based upon a careful study of the Sanskrit text of the *ṭikā* and the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the *kārikā*-s, the *bhāṣya* and the *ṭikā*. However, Yamaguchi's restorations are not always acceptable and, in several cases, the restored text is written in unidiomatic or even incorrect Sanskrit. In 1971 Ramchandra Pandeya published the Sanskrit text of the *kārikā*-s, the *bhāṣya* and the *ṭikā*.<sup>13</sup> According to the preface his edition corrects the text of the missing parts of the *ṭikā* with the help of the Tibetan version and the text of the *bhāṣya*. Pandeya has noted the readings of the *bhāṣya*, but his claim to have made use of the Tibetan translation of the *ṭikā* is not borne out by an examination of several passages of the second chapter. He seems to have done nothing more than to correct Yamaguchi's restorations according to his own light without any recourse to the Tibetan version.

In the following notes all references are to page and line of Yamaguchi's edition. P = the Peking edition of the Tibetan translation of the *ṭikā* in volume 109 of the Japanese reprint. R.P. = Ramchandra Pandeya's edition. Sanskrit words which have been restored by Yamaguchi are printed in italics.

P. 67.28-68.1: *yañ-na ji-ltar Dkon-mchog-brtsegs-pa chen-polas / de'i bsam-pa mya-nan-las 'das-pa yañ gnas-la / 'khor-ba-na yañ sbyor-bar gnas-pa zes bstan-pa lta-bu ste*. Yamaguchi's restoration: *atha vā yathoktaṃ Mahāratnakūṭe / tasyāśayaś nirvāṇe ca tiṣṭhati saṃsāre caprayogena tiṣṭhatīti* (p. 267.4-6). In his translation Yamaguchi refers to von Staël-Holstein's preface to his edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (Shanghai, 1926), p. XV: "The assumption that Sthiramati himself regarded Ratnakūṭa as the title of the work he had commented upon seems also to be supported by the concluding verse of the commentary." Yamaguchi adds that he has not been able to trace the quotation in the Chinese translations of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. However, it is to be found in section 16 of the Sanskrit text: *nirvāṇagataś cāsyāśayaḥ saṃsāragataś ca prayo-*

<sup>13</sup> *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra*. Containing the *Kārikā*-s of Maitreya, *Bhāṣya* of Vasubandhu and *Ṭikā* by Sthiramati. Critically Edited by Ramchandra Pandeya. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna, Motilal Banarsidass, 1971.

gaḥ. The Tibetan translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta has: de'i bsam-pa mya-ñan-las 'das-pa la yañ gnas-la sbyor-ba 'khor-ba-na yañ gnas-pa. R. P.: sa āśayena nirvāṇe tiṣṭhati, saṃsāre ca prayogena tiṣṭhatīti.

P. 72.7: *ātmātmaśūnyatāyāḥ* P.: bdag dan bdag-gir (P. gis) ston-pa-ñid. Read: *ātmātmiyaśūnyatāyāḥ*. Cf. p. 72.16: tatra satkāya-dṛṣṭiḥ pañcasūpādānaskandheṣv ātmata ātmīyato (Yamaguchi -ta) veti *darśanam*. R. P. *ātmany ātmaśūnyatāyāḥ*.

P. 73.21: *sarvagunadoṣasya prakṛṣṭāpanītasya paryantāśrayatvena buddharatne pariññānam*. P. sañs-rgyas dkon-mchog-la yon-tan dan ñes-pa thams-cad phul-du phyin-pa dan / bsal-ba'i mthar-thug-pa'i gnas-su yon-s-su śes-pa'o. Cf. p. 189.22: *sarvagunadoṣaprakarsāpakarṣaniṣṭhādhiṣṭhānatvād buddhasya*, P.: yon-tan dan ñes-pa thams-cad phul-du phyin-pa dan bsal (P. brtsal)-ba'i mthar-phyin-pas-na sañs-rgyas-su grub-pa ste. Read: *sarvagunadoṣaprakarsāpakarṣaniṣṭhādhiṣṭhānatvena buddharatne pariññānam*. R. P. *prakarṣeṇāpanītasarvagunadoṣasya paryantāśrayatvena buddharatne pariññānam*.

P. 79.16: kujano hi pratipattiyuktam api bodhisattvopamitam na jānīte. P.: skye-bo ñan-pa ni sgrub-pa dan-ldan-pa'i byañ-chub sems-dpa' la 'di'o zes mi śes-pa'o. Read: kujano hi pratipattiyuktam api bodhisattvo 'yam iti na jānīte. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.

P. 80.1: *sarvatragadharmadhātubodhapratibaddhasya*. Read: -pratibandhasya. P.: chos-kyi dbyiñs thams-cad-du 'gro-bar khoñ-du chud-par bya-ba'i bgegs-su gyur-pa. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.

P. 85.12: *bodheḥ sthitiviyātaṃ kurvantīti*. P.: byañ-chub-kyi gnas-pa-la gnod-pa byed-pa'i phyir. Read: *bodheḥ sthitivighātaṃ kurvantīti*. R. P.: *bodheḥ sthitim kurvantīti*.

P. 89.17: *tatra sādharmaṇaṃ bodhipakṣāḥ śrāvakabodhisattvayor aviśeṣeṇa tatrāvikārāt*. P.: der gtogs-pas ñan-thos dan byañ-chub sems-dpa' gñi-ga'i bya-ba bye-brag med-pa'i phyir de-la byañ-chub-kyi phyogs ni thun-mon-ba'o. Read: *tatrādhikārāt*. In the Tibetan translation of the Trīmśikā gtogs-pa is used to translate *adhikāra* (ed. Sylvain Lévi p. 29.18), cf. Nagasawa Jitsudō, 'Bonzōkan taishō Yuishiki sanjūjushaku goi', *Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō*, 40 (1955), p. 17. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.

P. 91.22: *aparipūrṇeṇa cchandavīryacittamimāṃsānām anyatama-vaikalyād [vikala]bhāvanayā ca prahāṇasaṃskāravaikalyād iti*. P.:

'dun-pa dan brtson-'grus dan sems dan / dpyod-pa rnam las gañ-yañ ruñ-ba žig ma-tshañ-ba yoñs-su rdzogs-pa dan / spoñ-ba'i 'du-byed bsgom-pa ma-tshañ-bas žes-bya-ba. This passage is a quotation from the *bhāṣya*, cf. Nagao's edition p. 33.10: paripūryā ca cchandavīryacittamimānsānām anyatamavaikalyāt / bhāvanayā ca prahāṇasaṃskāravaikalyāt. The Tibetan translation of the *bhāṣya* has: 'dun-pa dan / brtson-'grus dan sems dan / dpyod-rnam las gañ-yañ ruñ-ba žig ma-tshañ-bas yoñs-su rdzogs-pa dan / spoñ-ba'i 'du-byed bsgom-pa ma-tshañ-bas (Yamaguchi's edition, p. 35.7). Sthiramati's *ṭīkā* explains that samādhi can have two deficiencies (p. 91.21: samādhēr dvayahīnatā āvaraṇam uktam): 1. Lack of completeness because of the absence of chanda, vīrya, citta or mīmāṃsā (p. 92.1: tatra paripūrihīnatā tāsāṃ cchandavīryacittamimāṃsānām anyatamavaikalyāt). 2. Absence of bhāvanā because of the absence of one of the eight prahāṇasaṃskāra (p. 92.2: bhāvanā hīyata ity aṣṭaprahāṇasaṃskārāṇām anyatamavaikalyāt). R. P. reads aparipūryā instead of paripūryā. The edition of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* by Nathmal Tatia and Anantalal Thakur has apāripūryā. The instrumentals paripūryā and bhāvanayā depend on the preceding word in the *bhāṣya*: dvayahīnatā. In his edition Nagao adds a danḍa between-hīnatā and paripūryā. This danḍa is not to be found in the manuscript and has to be omitted.<sup>14</sup>

P. 95.16: *upaśāntiā gaurava utpadyamāne sattvāḥ saṃjalparddhyaprayatnena śāsanam pratipadyante*. P.: ñe-bar ži-bas gus-pa skyeste sems-can kun-brjod-pa dan rdzu-'phrul-gyis (P. gyi) bsgrim midgos-par bstan-pa rtogs-par byed-do. Tibetan kun-brjod-pa translates ādeśanā, cf. Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (ed. P. Pradhan), p. 424.10; rddhicetaḥparyāyāsraṇavakṣayābhijñās trīṇi prātihāryāṇi yathākramam rddhyādeśanānuśāsanaprātihāryāṇi. Read: ādeśanayārdhyā cāyatnena ? MS. . . rādyāvāyatnena. R. P.: sañjaldpaddhyā'prayatnena.

P. 96.22: *yathābhūtaśrutārthavicāraṇā*. P.: thos-pa'i don-la sgra

<sup>14</sup> In an article in Japanese, 'Some Problems in the Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, XXII (1974), pp. 402-406, which came to my notice after having written these notes, Funahashi Naoya discusses this passage. I am glad to see that he has arrived at the same solution. Funahashi has also written two articles on the *bhāṣya* in Japanese: 'Some Problems in the Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya - with special reference to the three chapters: lakṣaṇa-pariccheda, āvaraṇa-pariccheda and tattva-pariccheda', *Ōtani Gakuhō*, LII, 3 (1973), pp. 50-66; 'Japanese translation and study of the Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya (āvaraṇa-pariccheda)', *Bukkyō-gaku Seminā*, vols. 18-19. I have not yet been able to see the second article.

ji-bzin-du spyod-pa. Yamaguchi indicates that yathābhūtaśrutārtha is quoted from the *bhāṣya*, cf. Nagao's edition p. 34.17: ayathārutaśrutārthāvabodhāt. Read: yathārutaśrutārthavicāraṇā. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.

P. 101.9: viśiṣṭārthaprārthanayā sutarām ātmamātrikaraṇāt. P.: khyad-par-du 'phags-pa'i don-la smos-pas bdag śin-tu snod-du byed-pa'i phyir-ro. Read: ātmapātrikaraṇāt. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.

P. 102.11: śrutārthaṃ sarvakleśasahanādibhir' *apy abhedyāt*. P.: thos-pa'i ched-du ñon-moṅs-pa thams-cad la yañ mi 'byid-pa'i phyir-ro. Yamaguchi adds in a note that sahana is not rendered into Tibetan. His restoration is clearly based upon a misreading: mi-'byed-pa'i instead of mi-'byid-pa'i. The Tibetan translation has translated sarvakleśasahanāt rather freely: "because he does not slip in all impurities". Read: sarvakleśasahanād iti. R. P.: sarvakleśasahanādibhir apy abhedyatvāt.

P. 107.3: samādhisamāpattyādikam uttarottarabhūmiviśiṣṭaṃ sarvākāraṃ nānāvasānaṃ phalaṃ. P.: tiñ-ñe-'dzin brgya-la sñoms-par 'jug-pa la sogs-pa sa goñ-nas goñ-du khyad-du 'phags-pa mchog-rnams-kyi ye-śes-kyi mthar-thug-pa'i 'bras-bu. Read: sarvākārajñānāvasānaṃ. R. P. has the same text as Yamaguchi.

It would certainly be possible to propose a different text for other passages restored by Yamaguchi, but there is not much to be gained by correcting Yamaguchi's restorations unless they can be shown to be wrong or improved by making use of parallel passages. From the examples given above it is obvious that Ramchandra Pandeya has not made any contribution towards the establishment of a more correct Sanskrit text on the basis of the Tibetan translation. In his introduction he accuses Yamaguchi of having failed to read the MS. correctly and of possessing insufficient familiarity with the complicated grammar of Sanskrit.<sup>15</sup> Elsewhere in his preface he states that "many scholars, like Yamaguchi, have committed serious mistakes because of their preference for Tibetan or Chinese versions over original Sanskrit". Pandeya adds that "when the original Sanskrit is available, not much reliance should be placed on Tibetan

<sup>15</sup> Pandeya does not seem to have had access to the manuscript used by Yamaguchi. For a well-founded opinion of Pandeya's carefulness in reading manuscripts see Wezler's remarks in his article: 'Some Observations on the Yuktidīpikā', *Supplement II. XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag. Vorträge* herausgegeben von Wolfgang Voigt. Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 434-455.

or Chinese translations", but he seems to be unaware of the fact that a single manuscript (in this case a recent copy of a manuscript) does not represent the original Sanskrit text and that its value can only be judged with the help of Tibetan and Chinese translations. If Pandeya had carefully studied the Tibetan translation of Sthiramati's *ṭīkā*, his edition would have been welcome. In the study of Buddhist Sanskrit texts the Tibetan translations cannot be neglected without harmful consequences.